7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that Mr. Brady gave you, you were going to, the Klemmers were going to pick up \$11,500 of that, weren't they? THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE MILLER: And all that Mr. Murray would have to produce is \$19,500, right?

THE WITNESS: Right, but the limited partnership is structured such that that was the initial capital contribution, but it could be amended at any time to increase the amount, upon agreement of the partners, so if I wanted him to contribute more we could agree to do so.

JUDGE MILLER: Now, let me see if I understand If you wanted, the paragraph 5 of the partnership agreement provides for the \$30,000, right?

THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE MILLER: And then it says, "Upon agreement of the general and limited partners, the capital contributions may be increased over and above the total contributions set forth in paragraph 5 above."

> THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE MILLER: Now, if you go to Mr. Murray, who holds 65 percent of the general partnership, and you say, hey, we've got to come up with another \$30,000, and he says no. That's the end of it, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: Well, that's not --

JUDGE MILLER: Because you can't force him,

under that paragraph 6, can you?

THE WITNESS: No, but it's highly unlikely that he's willing to throw away his investment up till that point. There is no reason to presume that he wouldn't be willing to --

JUDGE MILLER: All I am saying is he's got control, doesn't he?

THE WITNESS: Control to what?

JUDGE MILLER: To any additional funds.

THE WITNESS: Oh, no, because I can add a different limited partner if I chose to, if he's not interested in going forward, then I could add another limited parnter. So I wouldn't be stuck with him if he were not interested at all.

JUDGE MILLER: All right. Go ahead,
Mr. Yelverton.

BY MR. YELVERTON:

Q. Let turn to this limited --

paragraph 12, incidentally, at page 5 of the limited partnership. "The general partner may not substitute a partner
in her place or sell or assign all or any part of interest
in the partnership business without the written consent
of the limited partner. Additional limited partners may be
admitted to the partnership only upon consent of the general—

on terms that may be agreed in writing between the general and such additional limited partners. The terms so stipulated shall constitute an amendment to this partnership agreement." Are you saying to me he has no vote on that?

THE WITNESS: No vote on adding additional partners?

JUDGE MILLER: That's right, he has nothing to say about that, you are the only one?

THE WITNESS: Well, it says that additional limited partners may be admitted upon the consent of the general partner, between the general partner and such additional limited partners, not the current limited partner.

JUDGE MILLER: So if you were to do that, you would dilute any profits that he would get under paragraph 9?

THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE MILLER: He would automatically have less than 65 percent?

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

JUDGE MILLER: Proceed, Mr. Yelverton.

BY MR. YELVERTON:

Q Ms. Klemmer, let us go back to the drafting and formulation of this limited partnership agreement and I don't want to ask too many questions that have been already

1	Q.	Turning to section 2, page 2, it has legal
2	qualification	ns in it. It states that David T. Murray is a
3	limited	
4		MR. BRADY: Can I look on? Do you have
5		MR. YELVERTON: Certainly, no problem.
6		MR. BRADY: If you don't mind, I'll also
7	guide it to 1	her to it to expedite things.
8		MR. YELVERTON: Oh, certainly, section 2,
9	page 2, lega	l qualifications. It has three columns, and
10	Valerie J. Klemmer, David T. Murray.	
11		THE WITNESS: Right.
12		MR. BRADY: Right.
13		BY MR. YELVERTON:
14	Q.	It has Mr. Murray's post office box number.
15	What was the source of the information for Mr. Murray's	
16	post office l	box and address and zip code?
17	А.	I suppose he would have provided that to
18	Mr. Murray -	- Mr. Brady if Mr. Brady didn't already have it.
19	Q.	Mr. Murray did not provide it to you?
20	A	No.
21	Q.	And you didn't provide it to Mr. Brady?
22	A.	No, I wouldn't have known it.
23	Q.	The next page, section 2, page 3, legal
24	qualification	ns. Question 5A and B. It's checked yes, that
25	a party to th	ne application has or had a broadcast application

pending before the Commission and one which had been dismissed with prejudice by the Commission. It refers to an Exhibit 1, which in turn states that Mr. Murray was a limited partner in Karns Broadcasting, Ltd., Karnes, K-A-R-N-S, a new FM in Karns, Tennessee, and was also a limited parnter in Corydon, C-O-R-Y-D-O-N, Broadcasters, Ltd. an applicant for a new FM broadcast station at Corydon, Indiana, and also Mr. Murray apparently individually filed for a new FM station at the University of Mississippi. What was the source of that information?

- A. I suppose he provided that to Mr. Brady?
- Q. Mr. Brady -- excuse me, Mr. Murray didn't provide that to you?
  - A. No.
  - Q. And you didn't provide that to Mr. Brady?
  - A. I don't believe.

JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Yelverton, would you do me the courtesy of reading the, if it's there, the BPH number or whatever it is.

MR. YELVERTON: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE MILLER: For the Mississippi station that he filed in his own right.

MR. YELVERTON: This particular exhibit has no file number. I believe an amendment was filed by Liberty sometime later in the proceeding which updated the

information on the University of Mississippi application.

Perhaps Mr. Brady could provide which amendment that was and file number.

MR. BRADY: I'll attempt to do that. Your Honor, according to an amendment, this was not executed when I spoke -- Ah, my notations indicate we filed this in this proceeding on February 13, '89, and the reporting in that particular amendment noted the fact that the application's, the file number we reported was BPH-851127.

JUDGE MILLER: 8-5-1-1 --

MR. BRADY: 2-7.

JUDGE MILLER: 2-7.

MR. BRADY: M-F.

JUDGE MILLER: M-F.

MR. BRADY: And for your information, Your Honor, this also reports that that application was returned as unacceptable for tender and that an application for review is pending.

JUDGE MILLER: All right. Thank you.

MR. YELVERTON: Your Honor, do you need the file numbers for the Corydon, Indiana application?

JUDGE MILLER: No, I just wanted to try to get a fix on Mr. Murray, how he was moving, where he was moving, what he was doing, and I was interested in what he was doing in his own right and Mr. Brady was able to provide

that information for me.

BY MR. YELVERTON:

Q. Ms. Klemmer, when was the first time you became aware that Mr. Murray had filed an FM application for the University of Mississippi?

A. I don't know. I don't remember that he told me or I just seemed to have read it. He could have told me and I forgot. I just didn't pay any attention.

Q Mr. Murray never directly told you that, to your recollection?

- A. Not that I remember.
- Q. And Mr. Murray never told you that he was an applicant for an FM in Karns, Tennesse?
  - A. Not that I remember.
- And Mr. Murray never told you personally that he was an applicant for a new FM, or at least a limited partner, I stand corrected, for a new FM in Corydon, Indiana?
  - A. He may have, I just don't remember.
- Q I would like to turn your attention to section 2, page 4, Liberty application, legal qualifications, citizenship and other statutory requirements. Question No. 9 asks in a very convoluted, legalese way whither the applicant is an alien. How did you know whether Mr. Murray was a U.S. citizen or not?

1	A. Those would be things an attorney would ask		
2	him, I would presume, not a lay person.		
3	Q. But you didn't ask Mr. Murray?		
4	A. No.		
5	Q. Did you ask Mr. Brady to ask Mr. Murray?		
6	A. I don't recall that I asked him. I guess he		
7	knew to do so, or he, as it turns out, he already had worked		
8	with him, so he would known all those answers.		
9	Q. Mr. Brady told you he had worked with Mr		
10	A. No, he didn't tell me, but I said, as it turns		
11	out, he did. So obviously, he either asked him, he knew		
12	that beforehand.		
13	JUDGE MILLER: Let me see if I can shortcut		
14	some of this stuff, Mr. Yelverston.		
15	You had never met Mr. Murray face to face up		
16	until just recently?		
17	THE WITNESS: This morning.		
18	JUDGE MILLER: This morning.		
19	THE WITNESS: That's correct.		
20	JUDGE MILLER: Now, you have talked to him		
21	on the phone initially.		
22	THE WITNESS: That's correct.		
23	JUDGE MILLER: When you were		
24	THE WITNESS: Deciding.		
25	JUDGE MILLER: Negotiating.		

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

pargraph said.

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have to satis- -- put the little "X" on the certificate, wasn't it?

THE WITNESS: Right. But my husband looked on with me to make sure.

JUDGE MILLER: All right, now, one more thing before we go back to Mr. Yelverton. I asked you some questions and we talked about paragraph 12 of that partnership agreement, in which I think the substance of your testimony is I can bring on an additional partner without the consent of Mr. Murray. Wasn't that in essence what you said? THE WITNESS: I bleieve that's what the

JUDGE MILLER: Yeah. And the last sentence of that paragraph 12 says, "The terms so stipulate shall constitute an amendment to this partnership agreement." Now, have you ever discussed paragraph 15 of that agreement with either Mr. Murray or Mr. Brady or your husband?

THE WITNESS: Let me see what it says.

JUDGE MILLER: "This agreement, except with respect to vested rights of the partners, may be amended at any time by the agreement of all general and limited partners." Doesn't that mean that he would have to pass on any amendment that you wanted to place in this partnership agreement?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, doesnt't that mean

that?

JUDGE MILLER: He, Mr. Murray, would have to agree to any amendment to the partnership agreement?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

JUDGE MILLER: Proceed, Mr. Yelverton.

MR. YELVERTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. YELVERTON:

Ms. Klemmer, I was asking you about section 3, financial qualifications. If you would look at that page and also section 7, page 2, certification, whereby you signed the application. It has a date, August 28, 1987. Do you have those two pages?

A. Okay, I have the one that I signed. I don't -- What was the other one you said?

Q The other one is section 3, financial qualifications, it just has some printed matter at the top.

JUDGE MILLER: Back up this direction, ma'am.

Yeah, that's it.

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. We already looked at that I thought.

BY MR. YELVERTON:

Q. Okay, well, I want to ask you some more questions about it. I believe you testified earlier this morning, that on August 28, 1987, you were in Asheville?

A. Uh-huh.

you have just described, the 100 foot piece, whatever it was --

JUDGE MILLER: 1.3 acres.

THE WITNESS: No, that's her total property.

BY MS. LAWLESS:

Q I am talking about the specific spot that you had said you agreed upon with Ms. Utter. Did you determine if that space -- Or did you have any basis to know that that space would be sufficiently large for the tower that you were to build?

A. She and Tim were engaged in that part of the discussion. I mean I wouldn't have any basis for knowing, but Tim did.

Q. So you had assumed that he had reached an agreement with her about that?

A. No. No. He just talked about what space would be needed. No, we agreed that she would be willing to lease space to me if I were awareded the station. We didn't agree on how much space a tower would take. We didn't have that discussion.

Q. You said that you have paid expenses and then you seek reimbursement from Mr. Murray, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you ever send him receipts or itemization of expenses, or proof of the money you have laid out?

the mountain, so the top floor, front door goes on a level 1 2 to the sidewalk, and then the downstairs, sides and back 3 are also sort of ground level on the other parts. She was 4 down on the lower ground level, out at the side of the 5 house. 6 Q. Okay. 7 JUDGE MILLER: Mr. Brady, any time now, okay? 8 MR. BRADY: Pardon? 9 JUDGE MILLER: Any time for our daybreak. 10 I want to ask --11 MR. BRADY: Go ahead and ask, if you have --12 JUDGE MILLER: I'll ask one or two questions 13 and then we'll go off the record. 14 MR. BRADY: I know where I am, so I can pick 15 up tomorrow. 16 JUDGE MILLER: Fine. Make a little asterisk 17 there. You entire career has been with public broad-18 19 casting? 20 THE WITNESS: Most of it. My full-time career 21 has been, yes. I worked for a number of commercial 22 stations, part-time jobs, college, summer, things of that 23 sort. 24 JUDGE MILLER: Are you dedicated public 25 broadcaster or would you go commercial?

THE WITNESS: I have considered that prior to moving to Asheville and I am pretty strongly dedicated to public radio. Public radio even as opposed to --JUDGE MILLER: It would have to be a good offer, in other words, or a good prospect before you would abandon it? THE WITNESS: Right. Right. Yes. JUDGE MILLER: All right. Let's break until 8:30 tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene the following day, Friday, July 7, 1989, at 8:30 a.m.) 

## Before The FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In re Applications of	) MM Docket NO. 88-577
LIBERTY PRODUCTIONS,	) File BPH-870831MI
A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP	<b>)</b> ,
WILLSYR COMMUNICATIONS	) File BPH-870831MJ
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP	)
BILTMORE FOREST	) File BPH-870831MK
BROADCASTING FM, INC.	)
SKYLAND BROADCASTING	· ) File BPH-870831ML
COMPANY	.)
ORION COMMUNICATIONS	) File BPH-870831ME
LIMITED	)
For A Construction Permit For A	)
New FM Broadcast Station On	<b>`</b>
Channel 243A At Biltmore Forest	ý
North Carolina	)
	<b></b>

To: The Commission

## DECLARATION OF BETTY LEE IN SUPPORT OF ORION COMMUNICATIONS, LTD.'S MOTION FOR STAY PENDENTE LITE

- 1. I am a principal and Chief Executive Officer of Orion Communications. Ltd.
- 2. Orion is a family-owned business now operated by myself and my sons, Barry Lee and Brian Lee. We have sought to obtain the Biltmore Forest, N.C.-FM frequency since 1986. We currently are the interim operator, in accordance with a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. We have steadfastly refused offers to "flip" the station or be bought out for large sums of money. We also have declined offers from third parties to lend Orion huge amounts of money in return for a controlling interest in Orion. We have jointly discussed on innumerable occasions our business strategy and concept. Not once have we wavered in our desire to own and control a family business. My late husband, Zebulon Lee made clear that Orion was to be a family legacy. and a service to our Community,

- 3. Orion participated in the FCC's closed auction of the frequency that began on September 28, 1999. Orion now been supplanted under the Commission's May 25th Order, and will be ordered from the airwaves, once Liberty Production LP ("Liberty") is prepared to go on the air. Thus Orion's business and goodwill will be destroyed without an opportunity for judicial review. In June, 1997, we were forced off the air by the FCC, which replaced us with the so-called Biltmore Forest Consortium. We did not regain our temporary operating authority until mid-January, 1998. We lost incalculable advertising revenues and markot share during that period and still have not recovered from it. If we are removed again pending full review, this is certain to recur and will destroy our business. We would not be able to recover our employees - the last time this occurred several of our long-time staff left and we could not retain them when we got back on the air. Advertisers left and would not renew after we came back on the air.
- 4. Our injury is exacerbated because Liberty should not have been permitted to bid in the auction. Liberty did not execute the Applicant Identity and Ownership Information certification and its bid should not have been accepted.
- 5. I ask the Commission to agree to stay its order pending judicial review, which we will take within the next ten days to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. There would be no harm to the public interest in awaiting the Court of Appeals' resolution of this case through the pending appeal process.

I have read the foregoing and declare under penalty of perjury that it is true to the best of my knowledge.

Executed at Asheville, N.C. this/2-day of June 2001.

Betty W. Lee